18 February 1983

MEMORANDUM FOR: C/HRPS/OP

FROM: [redacted] STAT

SUBJECT: Results of Comparison of Reasons for Separation

1. I have attached the report reviewing the reasons employees are separating from the Agency. Not surprisingly, the report shows that the majority of separations are due to retirements. For every 100 separations, forty are due to retirement; twenty are due to job dissatisfaction; twenty are due to personal reasons; and the remaining twenty are for miscellaneous reasons (including community dissatisfaction and involuntary terminations). Further, the relative proportions of the separation categories remain virtually constant for all the Career Service groups over the last three fiscal years.

2. The above findings suggest that the the proportion of employees who decide to separate their employment can be predicted with a great deal of precision. This may be very useful to us when considering the highly probable changes in the retirement systems and freezing salaries in 1984, because we can monitor the effects on the proportion of separations quite easily. The quantity of employee dissatisfaction could be accurately determined by how much the FY 1983 proportions deviate from our past separation experience.

3. Although the relative proportion of separations is virtually constant, two slight deviations were detectable in the DCI and DDI Career Service. In both Career Service groups the proportion of separations within the job dissatisfaction category is greater than the expected value by approximately 20%. The DDI's increase in job dissatisfaction separations may be attributable to the recent organizational change from functional to geographic specialties. The DCI's increase in job dissatisfaction separations may be due to the change in CIA management which resulted from the 1980 election.

4. In summary, the results show a remarkable degree of constancy in which almost half of all the Agency's separations are retirements category. Moreover, the methodology used in these comparisons can obviously be used to monitor any serious employee dissatisfaction that may develop during FY 1983 because of pending benefits legislation. Logically, I would expect increases in the job dissatisfaction and retirement categories. If these increases do occur, the extent of the increase can be monitored by measuring the type of separations at critical points during the year.

[redacted] STAT

A COMPARISON OF THE REASONS FOR SEPARATIONS DURING THE LAST THREE FISCAL YEARS

Within the PERSIGN database the stated reason an employee separates from the Agency is recorded. Upon request from HRPS, a computer program, written by I&AB, tabulated the number of separations within each of several reasons for separation categories. These categories were further combined into six unique groups which are listed below:

REASON FOR SEPARATION GROUPS

C - Community Dissatisfaction
J - Job Dissatisfaction
M - Miscellaneous or Unknown Reason
P - Personal Reason
R - Retirement
T - Involuntary Termination and Resignation in Lieu of Termination

Our major purpose in the following comparisons is to highlight any systematic trends for the reasons employees stated for separation. The initial questions are:

1. Do the percentage of separations in each reason for separation group change from 1980 through 1982?

2. Do the percentage of separations of the separation-reason groups depend on the career service group of the separated employees?

The approach to the first question is to compare the percentage of separations in each separation-reason group during the last three fiscal years. Table I shows the percent of separations across the separation-reason group during each fiscal year. From Table I we find that the total separations have decreased from a high in 1980 of [redacted] in 1982. Further, the percentage of separations across the different reasons for separation groups does not change significantly as a function of the fiscal year. It is interesting to note the higher percent of separations in the retirement group for FY 1980, suggesting that during a high retirement period 50% of the total separations are due to retirement.

STAT

TABLE I

PERCENT SEPARATIONS FOR EACH REASON

FACTOR FOR EACH FISCAL YEAR

YEAR FACTOR

FREQUENCY ROW PCT	C	J	M	P	R	T	TOTAL SEPS
1980	3.00	17.00	13.00	10.00	51.00	6.00	[redacted] STAT
1981	6.00	20.00	16.00	16.00	37.00	5.00	
1982	4.00	19.00	19.00	16.00	36.00	6.00	
	4.33	18.67	16.00	14.00	41.33	5.67	

STATISTICS FOR 2-WAY TABLES
CHI-SQUARE 7.687 DF= 10 PROB=0.6594

The second question is addressed by comparing the overall distribution of percent separations for the Agency with the corresponding overall distributions in the career service groups. The Chi Square statistic is used to detect differences between the Agency's overall distribution and the career service group's distributions. The results of the Chi Square are shown in the SAS statistical tables and show that the majority of career services are in congruence with the Agency's distribution. The DCI and DDI career services are the only exception to this basic finding. In both career service groups the percentage of separations in the job-dissatisfaction category is higher than the overall Agency value of approximately 20%. The reason for these consistently higher percentages in the job-dissatisfaction category might be the result of the political environment and report producing factors in the DCI and DDI.

From the results of the comparisons on the reasons for separation during the last three fiscal years and across the five career services, we can conclude that the percentage of separations in each separation reason category is very nearly a constant. Thus, we can, with a higher degree of confidence, predict that the separations in 1983 will be distributed across the six reasons for separations by the proportions shown in Table II based each 100 separations.

TABLE II

REASON FOR SEPARATION

	C	J	M	P	R	T	TOTAL
Proportion of Total Separations	4.33	18.37	16.00	14.00	41.33	5.67	100

YEAR=1980

TABLE OF SD BY FACTOR

SD FACTOR

FREQUENCY / ROW PCT	C	J	M	P	R	T	TOTAL
DDO	2	13	14	9	59	3	100
	2.00	13.00	14.00	9.00	59.00	3.00	
EXP	3	17	13	10	51	6	100
	3.00	17.00	13.00	10.00	51.00	6.00	
TOTAL	5	30	27	19	110	9	200

STATISTICS FOR 2-WAY TABLES

WARNING: OVER 20% OF THE CELLS HAVE EXPECTED COUNTS LESS THAN 5.
TABLE IS SO SPARSE THAT CHI-SQUARE MAY NOT BE A VALID TEST.

CHI-SQUARE	2.405	DF= 5	PROB=0.7908
PHI	0.110		
CONTINGENCY COEFFICIENT	0.109		
CRAMER'S V	0.110		
LIKELIHOOD RATIO CHISQUARE	2.428	DF= 5	PROB=0.7873

YEAR=1981

TABLE OF SD BY FACTOR

SD FACTOR

FREQUENCY / ROW PCT	C	J	M	P	R	T	TOTAL
DDO	4	8	24	11	50	3	100
	4.00	8.00	24.00	11.00	50.00	3.00	
EXP	6	20	16	16	37	5	100
	6.00	20.00	16.00	16.00	37.00	5.00	
TOTAL	10	28	40	27	87	8	200

STATISTICS FOR 2-WAY TABLES

CHI-SQUARE	10.511	DF= 5	PROB=0.0620
PHI	0.229		
CONTINGENCY COEFFICIENT	0.223		
CRAMER'S V	0.229		
LIKELIHOOD RATIO CHISQUARE	10.713	DF= 5	PROB=0.0574

YEAR=1982

TABLE OF SD BY FACTOR

SD FACTOR

FREQUENCY / ROW PCT	C	J	M	P	R	T	TOTAL
DDO	4	9	28	17	36	6	100
	4.00	9.00	28.00	17.00	36.00	6.00	
EXP	4	19	19	16	36	6	100
	4.00	19.00	19.00	16.00	36.00	6.00	
TOTAL	8	28	47	33	72	12	200

STATISTICS FOR 2-WAY TABLES

CHI-SQUARE	5.325	DF= 5	PROB=0.3775
PHI	0.163		
CONTINGENCY COEFFICIENT	0.161		
CRAMER'S V	0.163		
LIKELIHOOD RATIO CHISQUARE	5.416	DF= 5	PROB=0.3673

YEAR=1980

TABLE OF SD BY FACTOR

SD FACTOR

FREQUENCY| ROW PCT |C	J	M	P	R	T	TOTAL
DCI	9	30	2	13	40	6	100
	9.00	30.00	2.00	13.00	40.00	6.00	
EXP	3	17	13	10	51	6	100
	3.00	17.00	13.00	10.00	51.00	6.00	
TOTAL	12	47	15	23	91	12	200

STATISTICS FOR 2-WAY TABLES

CHI-SQUARE	16.383	DF= 5	PROB=0.0058
PHI	0.286		
CONTINGENCY COEFFICIENT	0.275		
CRAMER'S V	0.286		
LIKELIHOOD RATIO CHISQUARE	17.522	DF= 5	PROB=0.0036

YEAR=1981

TABLE OF SD BY FACTOR

SD FACTOR

FREQUENCY| ROW PCT |C	J	M	P	R	T	TOTAL
DCI	18	27	9	14	27	5	100
	18.00	27.00	9.00	14.00	27.00	5.00	
EXP	6	20	16	16	37	5	100
	6.00	20.00	16.00	16.00	37.00	5.00	
TOTAL	24	47	25	30	64	10	200

STATISTICS FOR 2-WAY TABLES

CHI-SQUARE	10.698	DF= 5	PROB=0.0577
PHI	0.231		
CONTINGENCY COEFFICIENT	0.225		
CRAMER'S V	0.231		
LIKELIHOOD RATIO CHISQUARE	11.014	DF= 5	PROB=0.0511

YEAR=1982

TABLE OF SD BY FACTOR

SD FACTOR

FREQUENCY| ROW PCT |C	J	M	P	R	T	TOTAL
DCI	6	18	9	29	20	18	100
	6.00	18.00	9.00	29.00	20.00	18.00	
EXP	4	19	19	16	36	6	100
	4.00	19.00	19.00	16.00	36.00	6.00	
TOTAL	10	37	28	45	56	24	200

STATISTICS FOR 2-WAY TABLES

CHI-SQUARE	18.325	DF= 5	PROB=0.0026
PHI	0.303		
CONTINGENCY COEFFICIENT	0.290		
CRAMER'S V	0.303		
LIKELIHOOD RATIO CHISQUARE	18.806	DF= 5	PROB=0.0021

YEAR=1980

TABLE OF SD BY FACTOR

SD FACTOR

FREQUENCY / ROW PCT	C	J	M	P	R	T	TOTAL
DDI	2	27	7	8	43	13	100
	2.00	27.00	7.00	8.00	43.00	13.00	
EXP	3	17	13	10	51	6	100
	3.00	17.00	13.00	10.00	51.00	6.00	
TOTAL	5	44	20	18	94	19	200

STATISTICS FOR 2-WAY TABLES

CHI-SQUARE	7.755	DF= 5	PROB=0.1703
PHI	0.197		
CONTINGENCY COEFFICIENT	0.193		
CRAMER'S V	0.197		
LIKELIHOOD RATIO CHISQUARE	7.867	DF= 5	PROB=0.1637

YEAR=1981

TABLE OF SD BY FACTOR

SD FACTOR

FREQUENCY / ROW PCT	C	J	M	P	R	T	TOTAL
DDI	7	36	8	20	22	7	100
	7.00	36.00	8.00	20.00	22.00	7.00	
EXP	6	20	16	16	37	5	100
	6.00	20.00	16.00	16.00	37.00	5.00	
TOTAL	13	56	24	36	59	12	200

STATISTICS FOR 2-WAY TABLES

CHI-SQUARE	11.906	DF= 5	PROB=0.0361
PHI	0.244		
CONTINGENCY COEFFICIENT	0.237		
CRAMER'S V	0.244		
LIKELIHOOD RATIO CHISQUARE	12.067	DF= 5	PROB=0.0339

YEAR=1982

TABLE OF SD BY FACTOR

SD FACTOR

FREQUENCY / ROW PCT	C	J	M	P	R	T	TOTAL
DDI	5	23	1	22	36	13	100
	5.00	23.00	1.00	22.00	36.00	13.00	
EXP	4	19	19	16	36	6	100
	4.00	19.00	19.00	16.00	36.00	6.00	
TOTAL	9	42	20	38	72	19	200

STATISTICS FOR 2-WAY TABLES

CHI-SQUARE	20.218	DF= 5	PROB=0.0011
PHI	0.318		
CONTINGENCY COEFFICIENT	0.303		
CRAMER'S V	0.318		
LIKELIHOOD RATIO CHISQUARE	23.870	DF= 5	PROB=0.0002

YEAR=1980

TABLE OF SD BY FACTOR

SD	FACTOR						
FREQUENCY / ROW PCT	C	J	M	P	R	T	TOTAL
DDA	4 / 4.00	14 / 14.00	8 / 8.00	9 / 9.00	62 / 62.00	3 / 3.00	100
EXP	3 / 3.00	17 / 17.00	13 / 13.00	10 / 10.00	51 / 51.00	6 / 6.00	100
TOTAL	7	31	21	19	113	9	200

STATISTICS FOR 2-WAY TABLES

WARNING: OVER 20% OF THE CELLS HAVE EXPECTED COUNTS LESS THAN 5.
TABLE IS SO SPARSE THAT CHI-SQUARE MAY NOT BE A VALID TEST.

CHI-SQUARE	3.747	DF= 5	PROB=0.5864
PHI	0.137		
CONTINGENCY COEFFICIENT	0.136		
CRAMER'S V	0.137		
LIKELIHOOD RATIO CHISQUARE	3.781	DF= 5	PROB=0.5814

YEAR=1981

TABLE OF SD BY FACTOR

SD	FACTOR						
FREQUENCY / ROW PCT	C	J	M	P	R	T	TOTAL
DDA	6 / 6.00	18 / 18.00	9 / 9.00	16 / 16.00	44 / 44.00	7 / 7.00	100
EXP	6 / 6.00	20 / 20.00	16 / 16.00	16 / 16.00	37 / 37.00	5 / 5.00	100
TOTAL	12	38	25	32	81	12	200

STATISTICS FOR 2-WAY TABLES

CHI-SQUARE	3.004	DF= 5	PROB=0.6994
PHI	0.123		
CONTINGENCY COEFFICIENT	0.122		
CRAMER'S V	0.123		
LIKELIHOOD RATIO CHISQUARE	3.032	DF= 5	PROB=0.6950

YEAR=1982

TABLE OF SD BY FACTOR

SD	FACTOR						
FREQUENCY / ROW PCT	C	J	M	P	R	T	TOTAL
DDA	3 / 3.00	22 / 22.00	15 / 15.00	17 / 17.00	40 / 40.00	3 / 3.00	100
EXP	4 / 4.00	19 / 19.00	19 / 19.00	16 / 16.00	36 / 36.00	6 / 6.00	100
TOTAL	7	41	34	33	76	9	200

STATISTICS FOR 2-WAY TABLES

WARNING: OVER 20% OF THE CELLS HAVE EXPECTED COUNTS LESS THAN 5.
TABLE IS SO SPARSE THAT CHI-SQUARE MAY NOT BE A VALID TEST.

CHI-SQUARE	2.074	DF= 5	PROB=0.8388
PHI	0.102		
CONTINGENCY COEFFICIENT	0.101		
CRAMER'S V	0.102		
LIKELIHOOD RATIO CHISQUARE	2.095	DF= 5	PROB=0.8358

YEAR=1980

TABLE OF SD BY FACTOR

SD FACTOR

FREQUENCY / ROW PCT	C	J	M	P	R	T	TOTAL
DST	2	19	22	13	37	7	100
	2.00	19.00	22.00	13.00	37.00	7.00	
EXP	3	17	13	10	51	6	100
	3.00	17.00	13.00	10.00	51.00	6.00	
TOTAL	5	36	35	23	88	13	200

STATISTICS FOR 2-WAY TABLES

CHI-SQUARE	5.321	DF= 5	PROB=0.3780
PHI	0.163		
CONTINGENCY COEFFICIENT	0.161		
CRAMER'S V	0.163		
LIKELIHOOD RATIO CHISQUARE	5.359	DF= 5	PROB=0.3736

YEAR=1981

TABLE OF SD BY FACTOR

SD FACTOR

FREQUENCY / ROW PCT	C	J	M	P	R	T	TOTAL
DST	3	26	17	18	30	6	100
	3.00	26.00	17.00	18.00	30.00	6.00	
EXP	6	20	16	16	37	5	100
	6.00	20.00	16.00	16.00	37.00	5.00	
TOTAL	9	46	33	34	67	11	200

STATISTICS FOR 2-WAY TABLES

CHI-SQUARE	2.753	DF= 5	PROB=0.7380
PHI	0.117		
CONTINGENCY COEFFICIENT	0.117		
CRAMER'S V	0.117		
LIKELIHOOD RATIO CHISQUARE	2.776	DF= 5	PROB=0.7345

YEAR=1982

TABLE OF SD BY FACTOR

SD FACTOR

FREQUENCY / ROW PCT	C	J	M	P	R	T	TOTAL
DST	2	29	16	11	36	6	100
	2.00	29.00	16.00	11.00	36.00	6.00	
EXP	4	19	19	16	36	6	100
	4.00	19.00	19.00	16.00	36.00	6.00	
TOTAL	6	48	35	27	72	12	200

STATISTICS FOR 2-WAY TABLES

CHI-SQUARE	3.933	DF= 5	PROB=0.5591
PHI	0.140		
CONTINGENCY COEFFICIENT	0.139		
CRAMER'S V	0.140		
LIKELIHOOD RATIO CHISQUARE	3.967	DF= 5	PROB=0.5542

ROUTING AND RECORD SHEET

SUBJECT: (Optional)

Results of Comparison of Reasons for Separation

FROM:	EXTENSION	NO.
[redacted] STAT C/HRPS/OP 1012 Ames		STAT
		DATE: 01 March 1983

TO: (Officer designation, room number, and building)	DATE RECEIVED	DATE FORWARDED	OFFICER'S INITIALS	COMMENTS (Number each comment to show from whom to whom. Draw a line across column after each comment.)
1. DD/OP-PA&E 1006 Ames	1 MAR 1983			PETE, I HAVE DIRECTED THE ATTACHED STUDY TO IRONS BECAUSE NOR STAFF HAS TRADITIONALLY REVIEW THESE KIND OF REVIEWS, HOWEVER, [redacted] STAT MAY HAVE SOME INTEREST IN THE RESULTS. THE SEPARATION STUDY WAS DONE AT MY REQUEST BECAUSE WE HADN'T DONE ONE IN SOME TIME. I THINK DON DID A VERY GOOD JOB.
2.				
3. C/PPS	2 MAR 1983			
4.				
5.				
6.				
7.				
8.				[redacted] STAT
9.				
10.				Allen Ugstad
11.				
12. File: Personnel Planning				(PORS file)
13.				
14.				
15.				

FORM 1-79 610 USE PREVIOUS EDITIONS